Asian Journal of Chemistry; Vol. 29, No. 6 (2017), 1171-1178

ASIAN JOURNAL OF CHEMISTRY

<https://doi.org/10.14233/ajchem.2017.20414>

REVIEW

Study of Biosorbents for Removal of Dyes and Metals

GHANESH GAUR and SAPNA SHARMA*

Department of Chemistry, School of Sciences, JECRC University, JECRC Foundation, Jaipur-303 905, India

*Corresponding author: E-mail: drsharmasapna@gmail.com

Received: 15 November 2016;

Accepted: 6 February 2017;

Published online: 10 April 2017;

AJC-18321

Different types of dyes and large number of metals are available in wastewater effluents. They cause unfriendly impact on human life, plants and creatures. Endeavors have been made through the present review to study distinctive sorts of biosorbents and their application to remove dyes and metal from watery arrangements through adsorption.

Keywords: Adsorption, Dyes, Metals, Biosorbents.

INTRODUCTION

Waste transfer has been an expanding overall worry in our nation. The utilization of waste materials for various purposes can assume a noteworthy part in taking care of transfer issue. A standout amongst the most critical technique by which these waste transfers can be utilized to remove dyes and harmful metals from wastewater effluents is adsorption [1]. Dyes, *albeit* present in just little sums is very perceivable and accordingly fit for bringing about different issues of a tasteful nature in getting water bodies [2]. They cause serious cerebral pain, bountiful sweating, mental disarray and comparative well being problems [3]. Therefore the removal of dyes from wastewater is generally alluring. In present state different endeavors have been made to evacuate these dyes utilizing waste transfers. Different strategies including precipitation, particle trade layer and electrochemical advancements have been utilized for the treatment of dyes and metal bearing mechanical effluents [4]. These innovations are very costly, not earth agreeable and generally subject to one of convergence of waste [5]. Therefore, the quest for productive, eco well-disposed and practical solutions for wastewater treatment has been initiated [6].

Adsorption is observed to be eco benevolent technique to evacuate these harmful dyes and metals from mechanical effluents [7]. It is a physio-chemical procedure which happens actually in certain biomass and this permits it to latently focus and tie contaminants onto their cell structure [8]. The word "adsorption" was instituted in 1881 by German physicist Heinrich Kayser (1853-1940). Adsorption is the procedure

through which a substance in one stage is expelled from that stage by aggregation at the interface between that stage and a different (strong) phase [4]. It is a type of technology which includes expulsion of lethal metals and dyes from wastewater taking into account restricting limits of different natural materials [9]. Biosorbents are low cost natural materials and obtained as a result of waste material from plant residues or from industry [10]. The review article deals with literature survey on utilizations of various sorts of biosorbents in purification of water by removing metals and dyes.

Classification of biosorbents: Biosorption is a perfect technique for the treatment of high volume, low fixation complex waste-waters [11]. Presently a day's exploration interest has been expanded into the creation of option sorbents to supplant the excessive initiated carbon [12]. As indicated by Bailey *et al.* [13], a sorbent can be viewed as minimal effort in the event and requires small handling, is rich in nature or is a by-item or waste material from another industry. Depending on the nature of source, biosorbents are classified as:

Waste materials from agribusiness and industry: There are different by-items from the rural and businesses which could accept to be minimal effort adsorbents. These are copious in nature, reasonable, require small preparing and are effective materials.

Activated carbons from strong squanders: Coal is a blend of carbonaceous materials and mineral matter and is the most regularly utilized for runner of activated carbon production [14,15] for its availability and affordability. A wide assortment of carbons have been set up from farming and wood squanders, such as bagasse [16-19], rice hulls [19], coir pith

[20,21], banana pith, sago waste, silk cotton hull and maize cob [22], date pits [23], corn cob [24], rice husk [25,26], sawdust [26], organic product stones [27], nutshells [19,27], pinewood [28], coconut tree sawdust [22,29], fly ash [30] and cassava peel [31] *etc.* Non-traditional activated carbons also showed high sorption properties [24]. It was reported that the adsorption limits of activated carbons produced using corncob had expansive qualities [12].

Agricultural strong squanders: Many scientists demonstrate that crude farming strong squanders and waste materials from woodland businesses, for example, sawdust and bark have been additionally utilized as adsorbents. Their physico-compound characteristics make these materials to show potential as sorbents and they likewise have minimal effort and are accessible in huge amounts [32]. Sawdust is effortlessly accessible in the farmland at an exceptionally insignificant price. It contains different natural mixes (lignin, cellulose and hemi-cellulose) with polyphenolic bunches that may be valuable for restricting dyes through various mechanisms [33]. A perplexing material containing lignin and cellulose as major constituents can be obtained from tree plants and were used for removing dyes [34].

Bark is a bounteous woods buildup which has been observed to be powerful in expelling distinctive sorts of dyes from water solutions [35,36]. In view of its minimal effort and high accessibility, bark is extremely alluring as an adsorbent. It indicates high tannin content which makes bark a compelling adsorbent. The polyhydroxy, polyphenol collecting from tannin are thought to be the dynamic species in adsorption procedure [37].

Industrial by-items: Different low cost and neighborhood accessibility, modern strong squanders, for example, metal hydroxide, fly fiery remains and red mud were considered as one of the minimal effort materials and can be utilized as adsorbents for colour removal [38-44]. Fly cinder is a waste material starting in substantial sums in ignition forms. In spite of the fact that it might contain some perilous substances, such as substantial metals, it is broadly used in industry in numerous countries [42]. Scientists reported that biogases fly fiery debris created in the sugar business does not contain vast sums of toxic metals and has been generally utilized for adsorption of dyes [43,44].

Natural materials: A portion of the regular materials additionally demonstrate great adsorption limits.

Clay: From earlier days, normal dirt minerals show high sorption properties and potential for particle exchange [45]. These dirt materials can be changed to enhance their sorption capacity [46]. The study demonstrates that the adsorption limits are generously enhanced by changing their surfaces with quaternary amines. The adsorption limit of kaolinite can be improved by decontamination and by treatment with NaOH solution [47]. Various reports show association amongst dyes and clay particles [48,49].

Siliceous materials: A portion of the normal siliceous sorbents, for example, silica dots, glasses, alunite, perlite and dolomite *etc.* are utilized for wastewater as a result of their abundance, availability and low price [50]. Among inorganic materials, silica globules show good results [51]. Their substance

reactivity might be expected to their hydrophilic surface, coming about because of the nearness of silanol groups. The surface of siliceous materials contains acidic silanol (among other surface gatherings) which causes a solid and regularly irreversible non-particular adsorption [52]. Other siliceous materials, for example, dolomite, perlite and glass have been proposed for dye removal [53].

Zeolites: Zeolites are permeable aluminosilicates and their structures comprise of a three dimensional system, having a contrarily charged lattice [54]. The negative charge is adjusted by cations which are replaceable with certain cations in arrangements. Zeolites demonstrate high particle exchange capacity and moderately high particular surface zones, which make them alluring adsorbents [55].

Low cost biosorbents: Presently a day's research with minimal effort sponges is picking up significance and the vast majority of the work is at lab levels. Various organic materials, for example, chitin, chitosan, peat, yeasts, parasites or bacterial biomass, are utilized as chelating and complexing sorbents and focus to expel dyes from solutions [56]. Biosorption is a novel methodology, aggressive, viable and is of low cost [57].

Bark and other tannin-rich materials: Timber industry creates bark a by-item that is viable due to its high tannin content [58]. The polyhydroxy, polyphenol collecting from tannin are the dynamic species in the adsorption procedure. Particle trade happens as metal cations dislodge contiguous phenolic hydroxyl bunches, framing a chelate [59]. Vegetables, fruits, seeds and plant derived beverages; vegetable tannins have gained considerable attention due to their nutritional value or taste [60].

Chitin and chitosan: The sorption of dyes utilizing biopolymers, for example, chitin and chitosan is one of the reported developing biosorption techniques for the expulsion of dyes, even at low concentration [61,62]. Chitin and chitosan are plentiful, renewable and biodegradable assets. Chitin, a normally happening muco-polysaccharide has been found in an extensive variety of common sources, for example, growths, creepy crawlies *etc.* [63]. Findings show that chitosan-based biosorbents are proficient materials and for removal of dyes [64-66].

Peat: Peat is a permeable and more mind boggling soil material with natural matter in different phases of decomposition [67]. Due to its polar character, peat can viably expel dyes from solution [68]. Peat is characterized into four gatherings, in particular greenery peat, herbaceous peat, woody peat and sedimentary peat [69]. This normal material is an abundant, generally economical and broadly accessible biosorbent, which has adsorption capacities for an assortment of poisons. It was observed that peat has a tendency to have a high cation trade limit and is a powerful sorbent for the evacuation of dye [70].

Miscellaneous sorbents: Various materials have been considered as minimal effort sorbents, for example, starch [71] and cyclodextrins [72]. Starch is the most copious sugar on the planet beside cellulose and is available in living plants as a vitality stockpiling material [73]. Starch is one of a kind crude material and is inexhaustible common polymer, reasonable and broadly accessible in many countries. They have a few different points of interest that make them incredible materials

for mechanical use. They have natural and numerous properties, for example, hydrophilicity, biodegradability, poly usefulness, high compound reactivity and adsorption limits. The hydrophilic way of starch is a noteworthy requirement that genuinely confines the advancement of starch based-materials.

Microbial biomass (Algae): Biomass from green growth, yeast, filamentous organisms and microbes has been utilized to evacuate dyes by biosorption [74]. Microalgae are a good choice for the bioremediation of shaded wastewater. Green growth gets vitality from daylight and carbon from the air and some search climatic nitrogen. The mass development of green growth is less expensive [75]. The productivity of adsorption is exceedingly affected by the structure of the colour, the types of algae and pH [76].

Yeast strains: Yeast strains have been utilized as a part of the decolouration of various dyes since they have numerous preferences for application in bioremediation, for example, a high ability to aggregate dyes [77]. Similar to microalgae, the instruments of decolouration by yeast can include adsorption enzymatic debasement, or a blend of both [78]. Adsorption on yeast biomass is more effective at low pH [79]. Colour formation is exceptionally connected with the yeast development procedure and its essential metabolism [80].

Filamentous organisms: The utilization of filamentous parasites in the decolouration procedure is an alluring option because of minimal effort and the likelihood of aggregate mineralization of the dye. Filamentous organisms oxidize dyes through peroxidases and phenoloxidases [81]. The development of filamentous growths, chemical creation and resulting colour formation are influenced by society conditions, supplement conditions, particularly with respect to N restriction, time, pH, temperature, carbon source, oxygen supply, added substances and salts [82]. Decolouration is more effective under high-impact than anaerobic conditions. Decolouration can be expanded if the pH is kept consistent with the procedure at a quality that is ideal for parasitic growth [83].

Industrial applications of biosorbents: Different biosorbents show numerous applications like:

Wastewater treatment: The expulsion of different polluting influences from our surroundings particularly wastewater is currently moving from the utilization of traditional adsorbents to the utilization of biosorbents. Routine strategies to expel debasements are costly, thus the utilization of minimal effort, bounteous ecologically well-disposed biosorbents have been tested [84]. Wastewater treatment application is applied in the sustainable design of green building [85]. The chosen approach consisted of sand filtration as a pretreatment, a micro-filtration (MF) or ultrafiltration (UF) membrane process and a final separation treatment performed by means of a nano-filtration (NF) or a reverse osmosis (RO) membrane. An experimental study to compare spiral wound membranes, operating under pressure, to flat membranes, operating under vacuum was conducted. The technical results and a preliminary economic analysis indicate the possibility of technological transfer of the membrane technologies to an industrial scale for textile wastewater reclamation [86].

Purification of biodiesel: Biodiesel refinement process with water is typically utilized biosorbent ability to solubilize

the glycerin, methanol and impetus, associated to its wealth and low cost [87]. Rice husk cinder (RHA) was effectively utilized as a biosorbent for decontaminating biodiesel from waste broiling oil [88]. It demonstrates productivity in the adsorption of natural and inorganic contaminations of biodiesel. The principle favourable position of utilizing the rice husk cinder is as a part of the utilization of an agro-mechanical waste contamination which, after use, can be reused as dirt remedial because of its substance of biodegradable natural matter (biodiesel, glycerin and leftover oil) and potassium (catalyst) [89].

Parasitic *Curvularia* sp. strain contains around 26 % of its dry weight as lipids with a fatty corrosive profile of hexadecanoic, octadecenoic and erucic. It shows a profitable financial effect or it can go about as a food stock for biodiesel creation. It additionally creates an exopolymer which go about as a decent capable bioflocculants giving flocculation movement came to 95 % [90].

Products of the soil squanders created in galactic amounts from nourishment handling and agro based business ventures additionally cause disturbance in metropolitan landfills inferable from their high biodegradability. Biosorption by these waste-based adsorbents can be utilized as a financially savvy and effective method for the evacuation of lethal overwhelming metals and dyes from waste-water. The consequences of the various studies on biosorbent productivity of these bio squanders show that they are separated from their wide availabilities with quick energy and considerable adsorption limits [91].

Removal of anionic surfactant and cationic surfactants: Three biomaterial squanders, for example, spent dark tea leaves (SBTL), spent green tea leaves (SGTL) and sawdust (SD) acquired from Narra wood were utilized to expel sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) from watery solutions [92]. Reports demonstrate that spent green tea leaves show most extreme expulsion productivity. Spent tea leaves are proficient and extremely practical adsorbent for expulsion of sodium dodecyl sulfate from watery solutions. Unfertilizable fruiting buds of mango plant *Mangifera indica* L, an agrowaste observed to be powerful expelling metal particles from parallel metal arrangements [93]. The adsorption scope of metal particles incorporates Pb^{2+} , Cu^{2+} , Ni^{2+} and Zn^{2+} particles from weaken acidic arrangements at particular pH. Maximum percentage removals of the metal ions: 95 % at pH 4 for Cu^{2+} ions, 10 % at pH 5 for Ni^{2+} ions, 10 % at pH 5 for Ni^{2+} ions, 98 % at pH 5 for Pb^{2+} ions, 98 % at pH 6 for Zn^{2+} .

Removal of phenol: Phenol is by and large found at high focus in effluents of coke-stove and numerous synthetic plants in India which is poisonous to oceanic life [94]. Rice-husk adsorption limit for phenol can be enhanced by initiating it thermally and artificially [95]. Rice-husk can be utilized as modest adsorbent to treat effluents of coke stove and compound enterprises. Rice-husk has the capability of supplanting the actuated carbon arranged from costly source like wood and coal. Phenol expulsion from fluid arrangement was concentrated on utilizing chitin as ease biosorbent [96]. Tests were carried out in the pH range 2-10 and adsorption was ideal at pH of 2. The Langmuir, Freundlich and Temkin models indicate great relationship coefficients ($R^2 = 0.990-0.993$). It further suggests mono-/multilayer biosorption, alongside a semi-homogeneous design of biosorbent surface.

Water softening: *Albizia lebbek* seed cases were utilized for water softening by the adsorption of calcium [96]. The outcomes demonstrate that at 25 °C, the adsorption expanded with the pH esteem. The results show that a superior adsorption was accomplished at a pH estimation of 10.82. Rate steady were determined by utilizing Lagergren condition and demonstrated that sorption procedure is quicker at higher pH values.

Biosorption and water treatment of Mg(II) and Ca(II) hardness was additionally contemplated utilizing heat inactivated *Fusarium verticillioides* organism (Fus) on nano-silica (NSi) for building up the NSi-Fus as a novel biosorbent [97]. Surface portrayal was affirmed by FT-IR and SEM examination. The (NSi), (Fus) and (NSi-Fus) sorbents were studied for evacuation of Mg(II) and Ca(II) by utilizing the group harmony system. Sorption harmony was set up in about 20 min and the information was very much depicted by both Langmuir and Freundlich models.

Defluoridation of water: The presence of fluoride (> 1.5 mg/L) in drinking water is unsafe to human health [98]. Different treatment advances for expelling fluoride from ground-water have been studied. Research shows that, Tamarind seed which is a family squander from the kitchen is utilized for the sorptive expulsion of fluoride from manufactured fluid arrangement and also from field water samples [99]. Clump sorptive defluoridation was investigated under variable test conditions, for example, pH, beginning fluoride focus, particle size and sorbent measurements. Optimum defluoridation was accomplished at pH 7.0. Defluoridation limit diminishes with increment in temperature and molecule size. One of the study demonstrated that *Vetiveria zizanioides*, a natural plant of Kerala, regularly known as Vetiver is a viable adsorbent for the expulsion of fluoride from fluid solution [100]. Phosphoric corrosive enacted Vetiver root demonstrated great adsorption limit than the crisp powdered Vetiver root. The percentage of fluoride removal increases with adsorbent dose and time at a given initial solute concentration. The surface and sorption characteristics were analyzed using SEM techniques. Freundlich as well as Langmuir isotherm were plotted and kinetic constants were determined.

It was found that the residual part of tea as a family waste was successfully utilized for expulsion of fluoride from fluid medium [101]. The defluoridation limit increases with expanding adsorbent measurement and contact time. It decreases with beginning convergence of fluoride arrangement. The correlation coefficients were determined by linear regression analysis and compared. Further defluoridation takes after second request energy and Langmuir and Freundlich adsorption isotherm. The surface and sorption qualities were studied by FTIR and SEM techniques.

Metal evacuation

Removal of cadmium: Biosorption of substantial metals is a standout amongst the most encouraging advancements requirement in the expulsion of overwhelming metals from wastewaters. It was found that banana peel as one of the minimal effort biosorbent, can adsorb cadmium particle from aqueous solution [102]. The biosorption was reliant on molecule size, arrangement pH and introductory cadmium particle focus.

Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy found that carboxyl, hydroxyl and amide groups on the banana peel surface were included in the adsorption of the cadmium particles. The molecule size of banana peel had no impact on the evacuation of cadmium particles.

Saccharomyces cerevisiae was chosen for contemplating biosorption with a specific end goal to survey the likelihood of using a brewery yeast waste biomass (CIUC distillery) for Cd(II) expulsion from mono part manufactured solution [103]. The biosorption of Cd(II) onto *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain was a possible, unconstrained and endothermic procedure in nature.

Removal of copper: Banana peel is the financially feasible bioadsorbent for Cu expulsion from water [104]. The banana peel could be recovered and reused till seven times without lessening effectiveness. The ideal conditions for biosorption were found at pH 6.5, biosorbent size as 75 µ, measurement of 0.5 g/100 mL and 1 h contact time. It was found that the carbons made from wheat, corn, sugarcane and Bajra agro-wastes can be effectively used in the reduction of copper from aqueous solution. Bajra was one of the most efficient wastes with an ability to reduce copper by approximately 98 %. Hence, agro-wastes being abundantly available can prove to be a low cost solution for removal of toxic copper ions [105].

Removal of zinc: One of the studies demonstrates that the *A. indica* bark was a successful biosorbent for the biosorption of Zn particles from aqueous solution [106]. The adsorption capability was emphatically influenced by various parameters like starting fixation, pH, biosorbent measurements, biosorbent particle size. The harmony metal uptake was expanded and rate biosorption was diminished with expanding starting grouping of metal particles. The rate biosorption increments with increment in the biosorbent dose and reductions with increment in the normal molecule size of the biosorbent. Experimental information was tested with the adsorption models like Langmuir, Freundlich and Redlich-Peterson isotherms.

Another result show that as bagasse fly ash, a sugar industry waste, has been converted into an inexpensive and efficient adsorbent. The product obtained has been characterized and utilized for the removal of Zn from aqueous solutions over a wide range of initial metal ion concentration (3.06×10^{-4} to 3.06×10^{-3} M), contact time (24 h), adsorbent dose (5-20 g L⁻¹) and pH (1.0-6.0). The removal of Zn²⁺ is 100 % at low concentrations, whereas it is 60-65 % at higher concentrations at an optimum pH of 4.0, using 10 g L⁻¹ of adsorbent in 6-8 h of equilibration time [107].

Removal of nickel: Exploratory studies demonstrated that chestnut marine green growth, *Sargassum vulgare* (algae) and *Padina pavonia* (algae), can be utilized to build up a proficient biosorbent for overwhelming metal expulsion from aqueous solutions [108]. The metal adsorption and desorption procedures were fast, with 70 % of the sorption and desorption finished inside 10 min. The adsorption isotherms took after the regular Langmuir and Freundlich sorption models.

Another result shows that the removal of Ni(II) by the fresh biomass (FBM) and chemically treated leached biomass (LBM) of *Calotropis procera* takes place. The scope of the work included screening of the biosorbents for their metal uptake

potential, batch equilibrium, column mode removal studies and kinetic studies at varying pH (2-6), contact time, biosorbent dosages (1-25 g/L) and initial metal ion concentration (5-500 mg/L) [109].

Removal of overwhelming metals: Six distinct types of non-living *Sargassum* biomass were concentrated on the premise of Cd^{2+} and Cu^{2+} uptakes [110]. Thus, expulsion of these poisons from mechanical effluents has turned into a critical concern. Higher pH values more often than not bring about higher metal cation uptakes because of brought down metal dissolvability.

The work was additionally done to test the likelihood of use of biomass of the *Reynoutria japonica* for biosorption of substantial metals [111]. Energy of zinc biosorption by idle biomass was quick and in the example with a biomass centralization of 10 g/L the greater part of the metal was adsorbed inside 10 min. The most extreme abatement of the zinc fixations was observed in the example of leaves biomass (99.4 %).

Removal of lead: It was found that waste plug pulverizes can be viably utilized for Pb(II) bioremoval from weaken watery solutions [112]. Higher Pb(II) bioremoval limit qualities were accomplished utilizing plug biomass without treatment as biosorbent (98 %). Rice husks, maize cobs and sawdust, were used at different adsorbent/metal ion ratios for removal of lead. The equilibrium adsorption capacity of adsorbents used for lead were measured and extrapolated using linear Freundlich, Langmuir and Temkin isotherms and the experimental data were found to fit the Temkin isotherm model [113].

Removal of arsenic: One of the investigation demonstrates that the banana peel (BP) likewise indicate potential as a biosorbent for removal of As(III) particle from tainted water [114]. Banana peel biomass can be utilized as a monetarily plausible biosorbent for the removal of As(III) particle from supplied water. The sorption of As(III) particle was observed to be profoundly pH and temperature subordinate. It was additionally found that sorption energy support pseudo-second request model with high direct relapse coefficient.

A low cost ferruginous manganese ore (FMO) has been studied for the removal of arsenic from groundwater. The major mineral phases present in the FMO are pyrolusite and goethite. The studied ferruginous manganese ore can adsorb both As(III) and As(V) without any pre-treatment. Adsorption of As(III) being stronger than that of As(V). Both As(III) and As(V) are adsorbed by the ferruginous manganese ore in the pH range of 2-8 [115].

Removal of dyes

Removal of material dyes: Modest and eco-accommodating biosorbent wheat grain has been effectively used for the expulsion of material dyes from fluid arrangements [116]. Remazol red (Reactive red 180) was at first utilized as a model material colour. The optimum biosorption conditions were contact time 4 h, beginning pH 2.0, introductory colour focus 200 mg/L, biosorbent measurements 0.25 g and temperature 20 °C. The exploratory results show that the acidic pH give biosorption of dyes on the wheat grain. It had been found that the response was unconstrained and exothermic in nature. One of the studies demonstrates that *Oreganum onites* stalks were

utilized as adsorbent for expulsion of both acidic and fundamental dyes from water [117]. All tried biosorbents were examined by FT-IR, electron microscopy and measuring the pH reliance of the zeta potential. The adsorption isotherms were fitted to Langmuir isotherm.

It has been found that the removal of different dyes from wastewater by adsorption on orange peels has been observed to be helpful for controlling water pollution [118]. For higher removal of dyes from material effluents adsorbent measurements of 1.5 g, ideal contact time was 2 h and the adsorption was observed to be higher for pH 7. Adsorbents arranged from orange peel, as a residential waste, effectively used to expel the methylene blue from a fluid solution [119]. It was discovered that orange peel was extremely viable when contrasted with other ease adsorbent inside brief period.

Removal of basic dyes: The capability of the minimal effort adsorbent *Azadirachta indica* leaves (Neem) to remove methylene blue from fluid arrangement was examined at room temperature [120]. Ideal condition for investigation was measured at pH (3-11), adsorbent measurement (1-12 g/L), contact time (15-240 min). The outcomes shows an extraordinary adsorption limit of methylene blue colour by neem leaves and propose another conceivable utilization of this adsorbent material in removal of dyes from aqueous solution. Tree plant, an economically accessible characteristic material, is a decent compelling sorbent for the removal of basic red 13 from wastewater [121]. Both increment of temperature and diminishing of the tree greenery molecule size brought about a higher colour stacking per unit weight of the sorbent. Ideal condition for successful decolourization of colour from fluid arrangement show monolayer sorption limit for basic red 13 as 1.01 mmol/g.

Tests investigated the staining of methylene blue from manufactured wastewater utilizing enacted coir essence, as a bio-adsorbent [122]. The tests were performed at five unique temperatures utilizing settled centralization of methylene blue. Most extreme rate evacuation of methylene blue utilizing enacted coir substance was 84 %. The removal of shading by coir essence was expanded by expanding the biomass stacking *i.e.* 40 g and pH 6.5 up to the ideal level and ideal contact time was 6 h. Adsorbents arranged from coconut coir substance, which is a household waste, prosperously used to remove the methylene blue from a watery arrangement in a clump savvy column [123].

The capacity of cattail (*Typha angustifolia*) leaves for the biosorption of malachite green, a cationic colour dye, from watery arrangements was also investigated [124]. Biosorption isotherm and energy of Malachite green by cattail (*Typha angustifolia*) leaves were examined through cluster sorption tests. The impact of working conditions like introductory colour fixation, biosorbent measurement and starting pH, mixing speed, temperature, ionic quality and biosorbent molecule size on the evacuation of malachite green was examined. Balance information was fitted to the Langmuir, Freundlich, Redlich-Peterson and Sips isotherm models utilizing non-direct relapse procedure.

Immobilized cook's yeast cells were utilized to expel malachite green from fluid solutions [125]. Treatment

productivity of the procedure was explored under different working conditions like pH of arrangement, temperature and contact time, measure of biomass and convergence of colour. Adsorption process fits both the Langmuir and Freundlich adsorption isotherms.

Removal of reactive dyes: Colour removal onto ease material is an appropriate strategy for material wastewater treatment. One of the agro-modern wastes was valorized by compound treatment and tried for its capacity to expel colour from fluid solution [126]. Tendu (*Diospyros melanoxylon*) leaves, a strong waste from bidi industry which brought on transfer issue, can be altered with the treatment of sulphuric corrosive [127]. Based the outcomes, modified wheat straw can be utilized as a generally effective and minimal effort spongy for colour expel from material wastewater [128].

The industrially powdered initiated charcoal for the sorption of responsive colour Brilliant red HE-3B from fluid arrangements were also used [129]. The impact of arrangement pH, beginning colour fixation and temperature and sorption time on colour evacuation was tested by the linear, Freundlich and Langmuir models. The dynamic of the sorption took after pseudo-first and pseudo-second kinetic models. The information show that the second-arrange condition was more suitable, which show that the intramolecule dispersion is the rate restricting component.

Removal of vat dyes: Biosludge obtained from a wastewater treatment plant was also show adsorption capacity to adsorb colourants, particularly vat dyes from textile wastewater [130]. Autoclaved and resting biosludge showed different adsorption abilities with different types of vat dyes. The adsorption ability of the biosludge increased with an increase in sludge age. Batch biosorption parametric experiments were carried out to check the removal mechanism of vat dye, namely, Safranin O, from the aqueous phase using biosorbent prepared from wood rotting dead macro fungus *Fomitopsis carnea* [131]. Kinetic experiments at various temperatures (19, 27 and 35 °C) were well described using pseudo-second order kinetic models. Raising temperature from 19 to 35 °C enhanced the dye uptake potential of the biosorbent from 1,000 to 1,250 mg/g. The other variables studied were, effect of common salt (NaCl) and pH on the dye removal potential of the biosorbent [132]. Decreased dye removal (%) efficiency at higher salt concentration suggests involvement of an ion-exchange type sorption mechanism.

Conclusion

This review article shows an attempt to comprise various aspects of different types of biosorbents which were used to remove dyes and metal from wastewater effluents. Various types of dyes are used for dyeing and printing of clothes. Dyes and printing industries are main source of water pollution in Rajasthan. The effluents emitting from these industries contain high concentration of dyes. These dyes cause serious health problems. Now a day's research shows various techniques have been used for treatment of dye bearing industrial effluents. The search of efficient, ecofriendly and cost effective remedies for wastewater treatment has been an urgent challenge. Among new technologies, plant residues were utilized as a novel biosorbents for the removal of dyes and metal ion from wastewater through process of adsorption.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks to Vice-Chairman, President and Ph.D. coordinator, JECRC University, Jaipur, India, for granting a scholarship for their research work.

REFERENCES

1. A. Bhatnagar and A.K. Minocha, *Indian J. Chem. Technol.*, **13**, 217 (2006).
2. A.M. Ismail, M. Loganathan and G.P.A. Theodor, *J. Ecobiotechnol.*, **4**, 1 (2012).
3. S.V. Yadla, V. Sridevi and M.V.V.C. Lakshmi, *J. Biol. Phys. Sci.*, **2**, 1585 (2012).
4. O. Abdi and M. Kazemi, *J. Mater. Environ. Sci.*, **6**, 1386 (2015).
5. D.M. Ruthven, *Principles of Adsorption and Adsorption Processes*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, edn 1, p. 124 (1984).
6. Y.M. Issa and A.F. Khorshid, *J. Adv. Res.*, **2**, 25 (2011); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2010.08.007>.
7. F.B. Abdur Rahman, M. Kter and M.Z. Abedin, *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res.*, **2**, 2277(2013).
8. S. Aravind and S. Kamath, *Int. J. Innov. Res. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, **4**, (2015).
9. G.M. Gadd, *Experientia*, **46**, 834 (1990); <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01935534>.
10. A. Tripathi and M.R. Ranjan, *J. Bioremed. Biodegrad.*, **6**, 315 (2015); <https://doi.org/10.4172/2155-6199.1000315>.
11. N. Ahalya, T.V. Ramachandra and R.D. Kanamadi, *Res. J. Chem. Environ.*, **7**, 71 (2003).
12. Y. Guo, S. Yang, W. Fu, J. Qi, R. Li, Z. Wang and H. Xu, *Dyes Pigments*, **56**, 219 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208\(02\)00160-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208(02)00160-2).
13. S.E. Bailey, T.J. Olin, R.M. Bricka and D.D. Adrian, *Water Res.*, **33**, 2469 (1999); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(98\)00475-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(98)00475-8).
14. F. Carrasco-Marin, M.A. Alvarez-Merino and C. Moreno-Castilla, *Fuel*, **75**, 966 (1996); [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-2361\(96\)00043-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-2361(96)00043-9).
15. M.J. Illán-Gómez, A. García-García, C. Salinas-Martínez de Lecea and A. Linares-Solano, *Energy Fuels*, **10**, 1108 (1996); <https://doi.org/10.1021/ef950195a>.
16. M. Valix, W.H. Cheung and G. McKay, *Chemosphere*, **56**, 493 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2004.04.004>.
17. F.C. Wu, R.L. Tseng and R.S. Juang, *Water Res.*, **35**, 613 (2001); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(00\)00307-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00307-9).
18. W.T. Tsai, C.Y. Chang, M.C. Lin, S.F. Chien, M.F. Sun and M.F. Hsieh, *Chemosphere*, **45**, 51 (2001); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-6535\(01\)00016-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-6535(01)00016-9).
19. M. Ahmedna, W.E. Marshall and R.M. Rao, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **71**, 113 (2000); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(99\)00070-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(99)00070-X).
20. C. Namasivayam and D. Kavitha, *Dyes Pigments*, **54**, 47 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208\(02\)00025-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208(02)00025-6).
21. C. Namasivayam, R. Radhika and S. Suba, *Waste Manag.*, **21**, 381 (2001); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0956-053X\(00\)00081-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0956-053X(00)00081-7).
22. K. Kadirvelu, M. Kavipriya, C. Karthika, M. Radhika, N. Vennilamani and S. Pattabhi, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **87**, 129 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(02\)00201-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(02)00201-8).
23. F. Banat, S. Al-Asheh and L. Al-Makhadmeh, *Process Biochem.*, **39**, 193 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0032-9592\(03\)00065-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0032-9592(03)00065-7).
24. R.S. Juang, F.C. Wu and R.L. Tseng, *Eng. Aspect*, **201**, 191 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-7757\(01\)01004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-7757(01)01004-4).
25. M.M. Mohamed, *J. Colloid Int. Sci.*, **272**, 28 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2003.08.071>.
26. P.K. Malik, *Dyes Pigments*, **56**, 239 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208\(02\)00159-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208(02)00159-6).
27. S. Aygun, S. Yenisoy-Karakas and I. Duman, *Micropor. Mesopor. Mater.*, **66**, 189 (2003); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micromeso.2003.08.028>.
28. R.L. Tseng, F.C. Wu and R.S. Juang, *Carbon*, **41**, 487 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0008-6223\(02\)00367-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0008-6223(02)00367-6).

29. K. Kadirvelu and M. Palanivel, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **74**, 263 (2000); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(00\)00013-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(00)00013-4).
30. S.K. Khare, K.K. Panday, R.M. Srivastava and V.N. Singh, *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.*, **38**, 99 (1987); <https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.280380206>.
31. S. Rajeshwarisivaraj, S. Sivakumar, P. Senthilkumar and V. Subburam, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **80**, 233 (2001); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(00\)00179-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(00)00179-6).
32. V.K. Garg, M. Amita, R. Kumar and R. Gupta, *Dyes Pigments*, **63**, 243 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dyepig.2004.03.005>.
33. L. Ping, F. Gambier, A. Pizzi, Z.D. Gdo and N. Brosse, *Cellul. Chem. Technol.*, **46**, 457 (2012).
34. Y.S. Ho, *Water Res.*, **37**, 2323 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(03\)00002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(03)00002-2).
35. R. Srivastava and D.C. Rupainwar, *Indian J. Chem. Technol.*, **18**, 469 (2011).
36. L.C. Morais, O.M. Freitas, E.P. Goncalves, L.T. Vasconcelos and C.G. Gonzalez Beça, *Water Res.*, **33**, 979 (1999); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(98\)00294-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(98)00294-2).
37. G. Palma, J. Freer and J. Baeza, *Water Res.*, **37**, 4974 (2003); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2003.08.008>.
38. C. Namasivayam and S. Sumithra, *J. Environ. Manage.*, **74**, 207 (2005); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2004.08.016>.
39. S. Netpradit, P. Thiravetyan and S. Towprayoon, *Water Res.*, **37**, 763 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(02\)00375-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(02)00375-5).
40. S. Netpradit, P. Thiravetyan and S. Towprayoon, *J. Colloid Int. Sci.*, **270**, 255 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2003.08.073>.
41. B. Acemioglu, *J. Colloid Int. Sci.*, **274**, 371 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2004.03.019>.
42. P. Janos, H. Buchtova and M. Ryznarova, *Water Res.*, **37**, 4938 (2003); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2003.08.011>.
43. D. Mohan, K.P. Singh, G. Singh and K. Kumar, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **41**, 3688 (2002); <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie010667+>.
44. V.K. Gupta, D. Mohan, S. Sharma and M. Sharma, *Sep. Sci. Technol.*, **35**, 2097 (2000); <https://doi.org/10.1081/SS-100102091>.
45. T. Shichi and K. Takagi, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. Photochem. Rev.*, **1**, 113 (2000); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-5567\(00\)00008-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-5567(00)00008-3).
46. O. Ozdemir, B. Armagan, M. Turan and M.S. Celik, *Dyes Pigments*, **62**, 49 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dyepig.2003.11.007>.
47. D. Ghosh and K.G. Bhattacharyya, *Appl. Clay Sci.*, **20**, 295 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1317\(01\)00081-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1317(01)00081-3).
48. M. Alkan, O. Demirbas, S. Celikcapa and M. Dogan, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, **116**, 135 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2004.08.003>.
49. C.C. Wang, L.C. Juang, T.C. Hsu, C.K. Lee, J.F. Lee and F.C. Huang, *J. Colloid Int. Sci.*, **273**, 80 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2003.12.028>.
50. A. Krysztafkiewicz, S. Binkowski and T. Jesionowski, *J. Appl. Surf. Sci.*, **199**, 31 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-4332\(02\)00248-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-4332(02)00248-9).
51. T.N.T. Phan, M. Bacquet and M. Morcellet, *J. Incl. Phenom. Macrocycl. Chem.*, **38**, 345 (2000); <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008169111023>.
52. P. Zucca and E. Sanjust, *Molecules*, **19**, 14139 (2014); <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules190914139>.
53. G.M. Walker, L. Hansen, J.A. Hanna and S.J. Allen, *Water Res.*, **37**, 2081 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(02\)00540-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(02)00540-7).
54. H. Ghobarkar, O. Schaf and U. Guth, *Prog. Solid State Chem.*, **27**, 29 (1999); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6786\(00\)00002-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6786(00)00002-9).
55. S. Babel and T.N. Kumiawan, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, **97**, 219 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3894\(02\)00263-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3894(02)00263-7).
56. F. Rozada, L.F. Calvo, A.I. Garcia, J.M. Villacorta and M. Otero, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **87**, 221 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(02\)00243-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(02)00243-2).
57. D.Y.C. Leung, G. Caramanna and M.M. Maroto-Valer, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **39**, 426 (2014); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.093>.
58. C. Troendle and R. King, *Resources Res.*, **21**, 1915 (1985); <https://doi.org/10.1029/WR021i012p01915>.
59. A.F. Cordero, M. Gómez and J.H. Castillo, *Polímeros*, **25**, 351 (2015); <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-1428.1529>.
60. M. Haroun, P. Khirstova and T. Covington, *J. Forest Prod. Ind.*, **2**, 21 (2013).
61. A.J. Varma, S.V. Deshpande and J.F. Kennedy, *Carbohydr. Polym.*, **55**, 77 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2003.08.005>.
62. Y.C. Wong, Y.S. Szeto, W.H. Cheung and G. McKay, *Process Biochem.*, **39**, 695 (2004); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0032-9592\(03\)00152-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0032-9592(03)00152-3).
63. M.S. Chiou and H.Y. Li, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, **93**, 233 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3894\(02\)00030-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3894(02)00030-4).
64. C. Chao, S.S. Shyu, Y.C. Lin and F.L. Mi, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **91**, 157 (2004); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(03\)00171-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(03)00171-8).
65. M.-S. Chiou, P.-Y. Ho and H.-Y. Li, *Dyes Pigments*, **60**, 69 (2004); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208\(03\)00140-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-7208(03)00140-2).
66. R.S. Juang, R.L. Tseng, F.C. Wu and S.L. Lin, *J. Environ. Sci. Health*, **31**, 325 (1996); <https://doi.org/10.1080/10934529609376360>.
67. K.R. Ramakrishna and T. Viraraghavan, *Water Sci. Technol.*, **36**, 189 (1997); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1223\(97\)00387-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1223(97)00387-9).
68. Q. Sun and L. Yang, *Water Res.*, **37**, 1535 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(02\)00520-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(02)00520-1).
69. S.J. Allen, G. McKay and J.F. Porter, *J. Colloid Int. Sci.*, **280**, 322 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2004.08.078>.
70. C. de A. Melo, L.K. de Oliveira, D. Goveia, L.F. Fraceto and A.H. Rosa II, *J. Braz. Chem. Soc.*, **25**, 36 (2014); <https://doi.org/10.5935/0103-5053.20130265>.
71. G. Crini, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **90**, 193 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(03\)00111-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(03)00111-1).
72. B. Martel, M. Devassine, G. Crini, M. Weltrowski, M. Bourdonneau and M. Morcellet, *J. Polym. Sci. A Polym. Chem.*, **39**, 169 (2001); [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0518\(20010101\)39:1<169::AID-POLA190>3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0518(20010101)39:1<169::AID-POLA190>3.0.CO;2-G).
73. Y. Shao, B. Martel, M. Morcellet, M. Weltrowski and G. Crini, *J. Inclusion Phenom. Mol. Recogn. Chem.*, **25**, 209 (1996); <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01041570>.
74. S.J. Allen, G. McKay and K.Y.H. Khader, *J. Colloid Sci.*, **126**, 517 (1988); [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9797\(88\)90150-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9797(88)90150-6).
75. A. Pala and E. Tokat, *Water Res.*, **36**, 2920 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(01\)00529-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(01)00529-2).
76. R.S. Juang, F.C. Wu and R.L. Tseng, *Adv. Environ. Res.*, **6**, 171 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1093-0191\(00\)00078-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1093-0191(00)00078-2).
77. H. Keharia and D. Madamwar, *Indian J. Exp. Biol.*, **41**, 1068 (2003).
78. M.S. Mahmoud, *HBRC J.*, **12**, 88 (2016); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hbrj.2014.07.005>.
79. T. Subasioglu and I.S. Bilkay, *J. Sci. Ind. Res. (India)*, **68**, 1075 (2009).
80. N. Das and D. Charumathi, *Indian J. Biotechnol.*, **11**, 369 (2012).
81. S. Sabat, R.V. Kavita, S.L. Shantha, G. Nair, M. Ganesh, N. Chandroth and V.K. Murthy, *Indian J. Appl. Res.*, **2**, 1 (2012).
82. D.H. Eikelboom, *Water Res.*, **9**, 365 (1975); [https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354\(75\)90182-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(75)90182-7).
83. Y. Fu and T. Viraraghavan, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **79**, 251 (2001); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(01\)00028-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(01)00028-1).
84. J.C. Igwe and A.A. Abia, *Afr. J. Biotechnol.*, **5**, 1167 (2006).
85. H. Rashidi, A. GhaffarianHoseini, A.G. Hoseini, N.M. Nik Sulaiman, J. Tookey and N.A. Hashim, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **49**, 845 (2015); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.04.104>.
86. M. Marcucci, I. Ciabatti, A. Matteucci and G. Vernagione, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, **984**, 53 (2003); <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2003.tb05992.x>.
87. M. Berrios and R.L. Skelton, *Chem. Eng. J.*, **144**, 459 (2008); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2008.07.019>.
88. S. Einloft, T.O. Magalhaes, A. Donato, J. Dullius and R. Ligabue, *Energy Fuels*, **22**, 671 (2008); <https://doi.org/10.1021/ef700510a>.
89. M.C. Manique, C.S. Faccini, B. Onorevoli, E.V. Benvenuti and E.B. Caramão, *Fuel*, **92**, 56 (2012); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2011.07.024>.

90. G.M. Abu-Elreesh and D.A. Abd-El-Haleem, *Pelagia Res. Lib.*, **4**, 218 (2014).
91. S. Patel, *Rev. Environ. Sci. Biotechnol.*, **11**, 365 (2012); <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11157-012-9297-4>.
92. R. Ansari and P.H. Khanesar, *Eur. Chem. Bull.*, **2**, 283 (2013).
93. M.A. Ashraf, M.J. Maah and I. Yusoff, *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **7**, 581 (2010); <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03326167>.
94. P. Jha, *J. Environ. Res. Dev.*, **5**, 421 (2010).
95. A.H. Mahvi, A. Maleki and A. Eslami, *Am. J. Appl. Sci.*, **1**, 321 (2004); <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2004.321.326>.
96. G. Pigatto, A. Lodi, E. Finocchio, M.S.A. Palma and A. Converti, *Chem. Eng. Process.: Process Intensification*, **70**, 131 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cep.2013.04.009>.
97. N. Fernandez, E. Chacin, C. Garcia, N. Alastre, F. Leal and C.F. Forster, *Environ. Technol.*, **17**, 541 (1996); <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593331708616416>.
98. M.E. Mahmoud, A.A. Yakout, H. Abdel Aal and M.M. Osman, *Bioresour. Technol.*, **134**, 324 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.01.171>.
99. M. Murugan and E. Subramanian, *J. Water Health*, **4**, 453 (2006).
100. P.S.P. Harikumar, C. Jaseela and T. Megha, *Nat. Sci.*, **4**, 245 (2012); <https://doi.org/10.4236/ns.2012.44035>.
101. N.K. Mondal, R. Bhaumik, T. Baur, B. Das, P. Roy and J.K. Datta, *Chem. Sci. Trans.*, **1**, 239 (2008); <https://doi.org/10.7598/cst2012.134>.
102. P. Kaewsarn, W. Saikaew and S.Wongcharee, The 18th Thailand Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry Conference, p. 20 (2008).
103. C. Majdik, S. Burca, C. Indolean, A. Maicaneanu and M. Stance, *Rev. Roum. Chim.*, **55**, 871 (2010).
104. M.A. Hossain, H.H. Ngo, W.S. Guo and T.V. Nguyen, *J. Water Sustain.*, **1**, 87 (2012).
105. N.N. Bandela, M.G. Babrekar, O.K. Jogdand and G. Kaushik, *J. Mater. Environ. Sci.*, **7**, 1972 (2016).
106. P. King, K. Anuradha, S.B. Lahari, Y. Prasanna Kumar and V.S.R.K. Prasad, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, **152**, 324 (2008); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2007.06.101>.
107. V.K. Gupta and S. Sharma, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **42**, 6619 (2003); <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie0303146>.
108. R. Ofer, A. Yerachmiel and Y. Shmuel, *Water Environ. Res.*, **75**, 246 (2003); <https://doi.org/10.2175/106143003X141033>.
109. P.K. Pandey, S. Choubey, Y. Verma, M. Pandey, S.S.K. Kamal and K. Chandrashekhar, *J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, **4**, 332 (2007); <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph200704040009>.
110. T.A. Davis, B. Volesky and R.H.S.F. Vieira, *Water Res.*, **34**, 4270 (2000); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(00\)00177-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00177-9).
111. I. Melcakova and H. Horvathova, *Geo Sci. Eng.*, **1**, 55 (2010).
112. J. Wash and C. Forster, *Biosorbents for Metal Ions*, Taylor & Francis (2003).
113. N.T. Abdel-Ghani, M. Hefny and G.A.F. El-Chaghaby, *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **4**, 67 (2007); <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03325963>.
114. S. Kamsonlian, C. Balomajumder and S. Chand, *Int. J. Chem. Sci. Appl.*, **3**, 269 (2012).
115. S. Chakravarty, V. Dureja, G. Bhattacharyya, S. Maity and S. Bhattacharjee, *Water Res.*, **36**, 625 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(01\)00234-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(01)00234-2).
116. K. Murali and R.N. Uma, *Int. J. Adv. Eng. Technol.*, **7**, 386 (2016).
117. E. Mavioglu Ayan, P. Secim, S. Karakaya and J. Yanik, *Clean-Soil, Air Water*, **40**, 856 (2012); <https://doi.org/10.1002/clen.201100153>.
118. M.R. Mafra, L. Igarashi-Mafra, D.R. Zuim, E.C. Vasques and M.A. Ferreira, *Braz. J. Chem. Eng.*, **30**, 657 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-66322013000300022>.
119. P. Velmurugan, K.V. Rathina and G. Dhinakaran, *Int. J. Environ. Sci.*, **1**, 1492 (2013).
120. D.S. Khichi, S. Bhati and A. Gupta, *Inventi Rapid: Water & Environ.*, Issue 3 (2011).
121. Y.-S. Ho, T.-H. Chiang and Y.-M. Hsueh, *Process Biochem.*, **40**, 119 (2005); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procbio.2003.11.035>.
122. V. Cheela, G.S. Kumar, D.V. Padma and C.V. Subbarao, *E-J. Sci. Technol.*, **9**, 91 (2014).
123. Jeyanthi and M. Dhinakaran, *J. Experi. Sci.*, **3**, 21 (2012).
124. E. Guechi and O. Hamdaoui, *Desalination Water Treat.*, **51**, 3371 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1080/19443994.2012.749191>.
125. P.T. Godbole and A.D. Sawant, *J. Sci. Ind. Res. (India)*, **65**, 440 (2006).
126. N. Yousefi, A. Fatehizadeh, E. Azizi, M. Ahmadian and A. Ahmadi, *Sacha J. Environ. Studies*, **1**, 81 (2011).
127. G.K. Nagda and V.S. Ghole, *Int. J. Environ. Res.*, **2**, 385 (2008).
128. B. Srivastave, V. Jhelum, D.D. Basu and P.K. Patanjali, *J. Sci. Ind. Res. (India)*, **68**, 839 (2009).
129. D. Suteu and D. Bilba, *Acta Chim. Slov.*, **52**, 73 (2005).
130. S. Sirianuntapiboon and S. Weerapon, *Water Qual. Res. J. Canada*, **39**, 276 (2004).
131. N.S. Maurya and A.K. Mittal, *Water Sci. Technol.*, **59**, 2073 (2009); <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2009.866>.
132. N.S. Maurya and A.K. Mittal, *Water Sci. Technol.*, **68**, 1048 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2013.339>.